



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/990,346 | 11/23/2001 | Stefan Boehm | 2000P20473 | 2233 |

466 7590 04/10/2003

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

DUNN, DREW A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2882

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/990,346 | Applicant(s) Boehm et al. |
| | Examiner Drew A. Dunn | Art Unit 2882 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 4-23 and 27-37 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 Nov 2001 is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO 1449) Paper No(s). <u>5</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |



UNIT STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER
OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Paper No. 6

Application Number: 09/990,346

Filing Date: 11/23/2001

Applicant(s): Boehm et al.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

The drawings are objected to because the box elements in figures 1, 2 and 3 need to be labeled in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 (a) as stated infra. Correction is required.

Specifically, 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) states that in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol *or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box)* (emphasis added).

Claim Objections

Claims 4-23 and 27-37 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See

Art Unit: 2882

MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, claims 4-23 and 27-37 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The limitation of “possibly present” does not set forth a properly distinct limitation as required under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further, the limitation “in particular” found in claim 2 is indefinite as to limiting subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Art Unit: 2882

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sudo et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,144,446 (hereinafter Sudo).

Sudo teaches an image defect correcting circuit for a solid state imager including a solid state imaging system which further includes a “self-test mode which needs no input by the user when the solid state imager is switched ON, the detection and interpolation of the defective pixel can be automatically carried out when the solid state imager is powered.” (See column 14, lines 34-38). Though Sudo is silent as to the use of the solid state imaging system with the pixel defect detection, the use of solid state imaging systems is old and well known in medical examination imaging so as to produce real time images. As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the Sudo solid state imaging system with pixel defect detection with any conventional medical imaging system for the advantages of Sudo’s teaching of a self-diagnostic being run when the machine is not in use as an imager thereby allowing for updated correcting of any future images being taken. Further, the setting of parameters for determining pixel defects based on the detection device detecting that a pixel is defective based on either an assigned value falling below a minimum value threshold or the noise in the assigned signal exceeds a maximum value would have been obvious well known parameters for an artisan to choose since these are standard value problems that occur in digital optical detecting systems.

Art Unit: 2882

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure has been cited as of interest as pertains to pixel defect detection and image/pixel correction.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Drew A. Dunn** whose telephone number is (703) 305-0024. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 8:00 AM to 3:00 PM Monday thru Thursday and every other Friday (second Friday of the bi-week).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722 or (703)308-7724.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [drew.dunn@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Drew A. Dunn
Primary Examiner Art Unit 2882
7 April 2003